

REMARKS

Early consideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

In this preliminary amendment applicant has placed claims 1-6, 9-15, 18-27, 30-36, 39-48, 51-57 and 60-69 in conditions similar to those corresponding claims contained in the Original Application Serial No. 09/743,442. Applicant has additionally amended these claims and intends this amendment to comprise a complete response to the rejections of claims 1-6, 9-15, 18-27, 30-36, 39-48, 51-57 and 60-69 set forth in the Final Office Action of May 1, 2003 in the parent application. Applicant has canceled claims 7, 8, 16, 17, 28, 29, 37, 38, 49, 50, 58 and 59, as the prosecution of these claims continues in the parent application.

Claims 3-13, 15-21, 24-34, 36-42, 45-55, 57-63, 65, 66, 68 and 69 and amended claims 1, 2, 14, 22, 23, 35, 43, 44, 56, 64 and 67 are in this application. Claims 70-80 are newly added.

At paragraph 2 of the outstanding Final Office Action of May 1, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9-15, 18-27, 30-36, 39-48, 51-57 and 60-69 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Trumbull et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,752,065) in view of Matsumara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,002,428). Applicants therefore, respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 recites in part as follows:

“An apparatus comprising...camera motion prediction information generation means...wherein the desired image signal is a signal obtained for learning processing that is performed automatically by a learning section of said apparatus.” (Underlining and bold added for emphasis.)

It is respectfully submitted that the portions of Trumbull and Matsumara relied upon the Examiner do not teach the newly added feature of amended independent claim 1. Specifically, as pointed out by the Examiner at paragraph 2 of the outstanding office action, in Trumbull the learning is done by trial and error by an expert operator (column 4, lines 35-38), whereas in amended independent claim 1 the desired image signal is used for learning by utilizing a learning processing section that automatically performs learning without the intervention of an operator. The learning processing for obtaining image vibration data is executed automatically by a computer. Also, Matsumara does not teach a learning process for generating camera motion prediction information. Matsumara merely detects a motion vector of an object by utilizing color information of a plurality of information blocks (column 1, lines 63-67). Indeed, Matsumara is not concerned with a desired image signal that is used for learning. Therefore, amended independent claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from the combination of Trumbull and Matsumara as applied by the Examiner.

For similar reasons, it is also believed that amended independent claims 14, 22, 35, 43, 56, 64 and 67 are also distinguishable from Trumbull and Matsumara as applied by the Examiner.

Further, claims 2-6, 9-13, 15, 18-21, 23-27, 30-34, 36, 39-42, 44-48, 51-55, 57, 60-63, 65, 66, 68 and 69 are dependent from one of amended independent claims 1, 14, 22, 35, 43, 56, 64 and 67, and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from Trumbull and Matsumara as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously discussed.

Applicants therefore, respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-6, 9-15, 18-27, 30-36, 39-48, 51-57 and 60-69 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

Applicants have further added new claims 70-80. Applicants submit that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection relied upon by the Examiner does not apply to claims 70-77 because these claims refer to a desired image signal that is used for learning by utilizing a learning processing section that automatically performs learning without the intervention of an operator and is based on motion vectors. Furthermore, applicants submit that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection relied upon by the Examiner does not apply to claims 78-80 because these claims recite a camera motion prediction information generation means for generating camera motion prediction information with respect to an inputted image signal, based on the camera motion estimation information of the inputted image signal. In contrast, the references teach learning done by trial and error by an expert operator. Indeed, learning is not based on any motion vectors whatsoever. Applicants therefore submit that the rejection of these claims over 35 U.S.C. 103(a) would be improper.

It is to be appreciated that the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art represent the present opinions of the applicants' undersigned attorney and, in the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where in the reference or references, there is the bases for a contrary view.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By:

Gordon Kessler  
Reg. No. 38,511  
(212) 588-0800